

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 22 2011

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Serial Number: 10/820,561)
Filing Date: 4/8/2004) Examiner: Armando Rodriguez
Applicant: Tong Zhang)
Appn. Title: Single-Mode Operation and Frequency) GAU: 2828
Conversions for Solid-State Lasers)
Fax: 571-273-8300

Fax via computer on February 21, 2011
Salt Lake City, UT 84115

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Amendment / Remarks and Argument

Sir:

This amendment is in reply to the Office action of "Petition Decision" dated January 6, 2011 and in compliance with its request for "a separate amendment" before the Examiner. The Office action was in response to applicant's petition filed November 15, 2010.

Applicant was kindly advised by the Attorney via phone conversation on 02/17/2011 that petitioner can send a new petition for reconsideration with a separate amendment first. Later if failed petitioner could file a submission with new argument and fee for RCE before the Examiner.

On the other hand, this amendment is also in reply to the Office action of "Petition Decision" dated October 8, 2010 so as to provide remarks and argument on the Examiner's comments. The Office action is in response to applicant's petition filed September 7, 2010, to revive the above-identified application.

In the last section of "Petition Decision" dated October 8, 2010, i.e., the section of "The present petition and amendment", it states that "As to item (1), the Examiner has reviewed the Amendment filed February 16, 2010, and concluded that the Amendment fails to place the application in condition for allowance. ---". However, the Examiner in his comments has made a misunderstanding in laser physics and a basic mistake in the principle and concept about a patent.